

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 22-27, 29-34, 43-54 and 59-62 are pending in this application and subject to consideration. Claims 14-21, 35-42 and 55-58 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 8-13, 22-26, 29-34, 43-54, and 59-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimune et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,233) in view of Sears et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,482) and further in view of Quentin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,208,745); and claims 6 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimune in view of Sears, and further in view of Huffman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,663,748). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as follows.

As a preliminary matter, it appears a typographical error occurred on page 2 of the Office Action for the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-13, 22-26, 29-34, 43-54 and 59-62. It appears that U.S. Patent No. 5,208,745 to Quentin et al. was not included in the cited references for the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. However, the Office Action, on page 3, uses Quentin in the rejection of claims 2-3, 45-46 and 53-54. Therefore, the Applicants believe that Quentin should have been listed in the rejection on Page 2 of the Office Action, and are traversing the rejection based upon this assumption.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshimune, Sears, Quentin and Huffman, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for providing text-to-audio conversion of an electronic book displayed on a viewer, the method including at

least the following combination of features: “selecting an electronic book for viewing from a list of available electronic books stored in an operations center; displaying a page of the selected electronic book on the viewer, the page including text, wherein the operations center is remote from the viewer; receiving a selection of text on the displayed page to be provided in audio; and providing at least a portion of the selected text in corresponding audio,” as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action, on page 2, asserts that Yoshimune discloses “selecting an electronic book from a list of available electronic books stored (52) in an operation data center (50), where the operation center is remote.”

Yoshimune, in Fig. 5 and col. 12, lines 35-45 and col. 13, lines 10-18, discloses a data center 50 for managing and executing “the broadcasting of book data” from the data center to the user terminal. Moreover, Yoshimune discloses “supplying the book data stored in the book data storage unit 52 of the computer 51 to the broadcasting facility 54 in accordance with the broadcast schedule registered in advance.” However, broadcasting book data from a data center to the user terminal in accordance with a broadcast schedule registered in advance, as disclosed in Yoshimune, does not disclose or suggest “selecting an electronic book for viewing from a list of available electronic books stored in an operations center. . . wherein the operations center is remote from the viewer,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added).

In contrast, Yoshimune, in col. 13, lines 47-52, discloses at the user terminal, “as the desired book is selected by the user on the book menu, the book data management unit 62 supplies the file name of the selected book data to the book data display unit 63, and the book-data management unit 63 reads out the corresponding book data from the

large capacity file memory 64.” Thus, Yoshimune selects an electronic book for viewing from a memory in the user terminal, not from “an operations center...remote from the viewer,” as recited in claim 1.

Sears, Quentin and Huffman fail to disclose the above features, and therefore, fail to cure the above noted deficiencies of Yoshimune.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. For similar reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 8, 11, 22, 29, 32 and 43 are also allowable over the cited references.

As claims 1, 8, 11, 22, 29, 32, 43 and 51 are allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 2-6, 9-10, 12-13, 23-27, 30-31, 33-34, 44-50, 52-54, and 59-62, which depend from claims 1, 8, 11, 22, 29, 32, 43 and 51, respectively, are likewise allowable over the cited references, as well as for the additional features recited therein.


### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 8-13, 22-27, 29-34, 43-54 and 59-62 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 026880-00014.**

Respectfully submitted,



---

Tiffany J. Brooks  
Registration Number 57,912

Customer Number 004372  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: 202-857-6000  
Fax: 202-638-4810

TJB:elp